HB8A	GARCps		237 Tiled 12/04/17 Fage	
		DISTRICT COURT		
		RICT OF NEW YORK		
UNIT	ED STATES	OF AMERICA,		
	V.		10-cr-367	(KBF)
JOHN	NY NUNEZ G	SARCIA,		
		Defendant.		
		x		
			New York, 1 November 8 9:50 a.m.	
Befo	re:			
		HON. KATHERI	NE B. FORREST	
			District Ju	dge
		APPEA	RANCES	
JOON	H. KIM			
BY:	Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York ALINE FLODR, ESQ.			
	MICHAEL F	ERRARA, ESQ. United States At	tornevs	
מחוזע			corneys	
111101/	EW FRISCH, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant			
7120	Dresont.	Dagoberto Orrant	ia	
VISO	LTEPELLC:	David Mintz Spanish Interpre		
		Colleen Geier		
		Paralegal, U.S.	Attorney's Office	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (In open court)

THE CLERK: In the matter United States of America v. Johnny Nuñez Garcia, 10-cr-367.

Counsel, please state your names for the record.

MS. FLODR: Good morning, your Honor. Aline Flodr and Michael Ferrara on behalf of the United States. And also at counsel table is Colleen Geier.

MR. FERRARA: Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. FRISCH: Good morning, Judge. For Mr. Garcia, Andrew Frisch.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Frisch.

And the Court notes that Mr. Garcia is here and present in the courtroom. Good morning.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

MR. FRISCH: If I could speak for the record,
Mr. Garcia advises me that English is fine. He speaks English
well. I have been able to communicate with him, with the
interpreter being here just in case as a help.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So let me just see. Mr. Garcia, he has, I see, the equipment in his hand. And when he needs to, you can listen to it as much as needed. It's important that you hear and understand everything.

MR. FRISCH: Your Honor, Mr. Garcia has asked if it's

possible for his sister, who is in the audience, to be given a set of headphones so she can follow along.

THE COURT: Yes. If we have an extra set, that's not a problem.

All right. So I see the interpreter is giving a set to his sister.

OK, folks. So let's get ourselves oriented here. We are here on the petition under 2255 by Mr. Garcia. I have set this down for a hearing on one issue, which is whether a notice of appeal, whether Mr. Garcia had asked for a notice of appeal to have been filed. But in preparing for this hearing, I now think we might more appropriately go in another direction.

I will give you some background on how I got here, which is that I attended a Bureau of Prisons session here in the courthouse that was run really for probation last week -- about a week ago, Joe, right? No, a week ago exactly.

At that session, the Bureau of Prisons spent some time -- these were individuals who do computation -- on 5G1.3(b), and went through this in some detail. And frankly I learned things during that session and it made clearer to me how to handle certain things under 5G1.3(b).

In preparing for this hearing, I noted that Mr. Di Chiara, who was Mr. Garcia's attorney at the time of the resentencing, had explicitly raised 5G1.3 as an issue that needed to be addressed in the judgment. And we had some very

brief back-and-forth at the sentencing. I then had the government and defense counsel confer, and I got some language for that issue. However, I neglected a very important piece of it, and this is a clerical omission but an important one, which is, under 5G1.3(b), as I believe Mr. Di Chiara had indicated on the transcript, the sentence needed to explicitly state that it be concurrent with the state sentence. That's mandatory, when it's related conduct. And as we know, to sort of go back in time, the defendant, Mr. Garcia, been arrested by the state in January of 2010. He then was convicted of a firearm charge in July of 2010. Meanwhile, he was brought into federal custody by a writ in May of 2010.

Now, we did take care of the 5G1.3 reduction for the time served between the initial arrest and the conviction by the federal court in 2013 in the J&C. We reduced his sentence by 27 months. And that was appropriate. However, what I did not do, although it should have been done and was intended to have been done, was to explicitly state that the remainder of the sentence, which is some period of time that will be calculated by the BOP but it could be in the vicinity of, again, two years, that that must run concurrent.

The failure to do that, I now understand better from the BOP, will result in it being consecutive. So an inability to actually fix that in any other way would prejudice

Mr. Garcia. It is mandatory that that occur, in the sense that

5G1.3 is a mandatory provision; it requires reduction under 5G1.3(b). It also requires a concurrent state sentence, if it's related to the federal conviction, and, here, we have that overlap.

So I believe that the appropriate thing to do right now is to simply state — to reissue, under Fed.R.Crim.P. 36, a new J&C, which will state explicitly Count One is 120, Count Two is the reduced amount — I've got it all set out — and that it's to run 97 months for Count Two, and that the sentence should run concurrent with the undischarged remainder of the state sentence, because otherwise, as I now have an appeal, he will not go to the transcript. And Mr. Di Chiara was quite — was explicit, I think, in the 5G1.3 meeting, to be taken into account, and that was certainly everyone's intent.

So what I would propose to do is to do a revised J&C, under Rule 36. That will then trigger a new notice of appeal.

Mr. Frisch, I suggest that you confer and get that filed today, if that's what the defendant still would like to do, but I think that would actually take care of this issue.

I frankly don't think any of the bases of appeal were particularly strong. I don't want to indicate in any way, at all, that I think that there was any issue that was going to be successful for Mr. Garcia on appeal. However, if he would like to file a notice of appeal, he could do so.

I will also say, this will not change anything at all

about what I'm about to do, but the letter that was handed up, that was handed in, is odd. It seems to be conveniently worded to suggest issues that one wouldn't prospectively have anticipated. But let's put that to the side.

Do you folks agree that this omission under Rule 36 should be taken care of in the manner that I have suggested, retriggering the right to appeal? Let me talk to the government. Ms. Flodr?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. Based on what you have explained to us, we think that that's the appropriate way to go.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Frisch?

MR. FRISCH: It makes sense to me, Judge, yes.

THE COURT: All right. So let's do that. What I will do is be crystal clear. This could save the defendant, depending on how the BOP -- I don't know how they have calculated the time, but it could save a substantial chunk of time if they've done a consecutive sentence. Let's do that.

That then moots the current petition, because it will be a brand-new J&C, which is the result that was effectively sought and would have been obtained in the first place. That was the only issue that was live.

So I don't know that there is anything else to do today. I will issue this today. And we can proceed to papers.

Mr. Di Chiara, I don't think there's any more need for

```
you to have to be here.
1
2
               MR. DI CHIARA: Thank you, Judge.
 3
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
               Anything further?
 4
5
               MS. FLODR: Nothing from the government, your Honor.
6
               MR. FRISCH: No, your Honor. It is my intention,
 7
      based on Mr. Garcia's instructions, to file a notice of appeal,
8
      based on the protocol your Honor announced today.
9
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Frisch.
10
               We're adjourned.
                                     000
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```